

### **Remarks**

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the application be forwarded along to issuance. Claims 1-26 are pending. Claim 1, 7, 13, 18, 21, and 24-26 have been amended herein.

### **Statement of Substance of Examiner Interview dated 3/13/08**

Applicant would like to sincerely thank Examiner Miranda Le for her time in discussing this application over the phone on 3/13/08, with Applicant's attorney Daniel T. McGinnity.

During this interview, the §103 rejections based on Britton and Anderson were discussed. In the interest of expediting allowance of the subject application and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicant's attorney proposed subject matter for amendments to clarify claimed aspects. The Examiner provided helpful input on the proposed amendments and suggested subject matter for amendments to overcome the outstanding rejections. No Agreement was reached.

Accordingly, amendments have been made to the independent claims herein in the spirit of those discussed during the interview along with additional changes based upon the input from the Examiner. The Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain that would prevent the allowance of the application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issues.



### **35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections**

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,591,289 (“Britton”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,398 (“Andersen”).

Claims 2, 7, 9, 10, 12-14, 16-17, 19-22 and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Britton in view of Andersen and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,442 (“Crater”).

Claims 4, 11, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Britton in view of Andersen and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,845,500 (“Ponticelli”).

Claims 8, 15, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Britton in view of Andersen in further view of Crater and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,139,814 (“Dinovo”). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Nevertheless, in the interest of expediting allowance of the subject application and without conceding the propriety of the outstanding rejections, claims have been amended in accordance with the interview on 3/13/08.



## **Claim Amendments**

Each of the independent claims 1, 7, 13, 18, 21, and 24 has been amended herein to incorporate, in varying terms and scope, user interface template files that are created in a declarative language used to produce a compiled file that is executable through an application programming interface of an application that takes advantage of a system language to separate the presentation from the business logic. For example:

**Claim 13** as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics) recites a method comprising

- creating a plurality of user interface templates associated with a Web-based application, wherein the plurality of user interface templates are created using an Active Server Page Language ***and the Web-based application uses an Internet service application programming interface (ISAPI) to implement business logic separately from the plurality of user interfaces;***
- compiling the plurality of user interface templates into a plurality of byte codes prior to execution; and
- storing the plurality of byte codes associated with the plurality of user interface templates in a single file, wherein the byte codes are capable of being executed by an execution engine in a Web server, ***the execution engine comprises run time code of the ISAPI that executes the single file derived from the plurality of user interface templates created using an Active Server Page Language to generate Web pages using a system language of the ISAPI.***



**Claim 1** as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics) recites a method comprising:

- receiving a request for a Web page;
- identifying an Active Server Page associated with the requested Web page, wherein the Active Server Page includes *a compiled user interface template created using an Active Server Page Language which when compiled is executed through an application programming interface developed using a system language to generate the requested Web Page in the system language from the user interface template created using the Active Server Page Language;*
- *executing the Active Server Page through the application programming interface to generate the requested Web page;* and
- providing the requested Web page to a source of the request.

**Claim 24** as amended (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics) recites one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to:

- create a plurality of user interface templates associated with a Web-based application, wherein the plurality of user interface templates are created using an Active Server Page Language *and the Web-based application uses an application programming interface in a system language to implement business logic separately from the plurality of user interfaces;*
- *compile the plurality of user interface templates into a plurality of byte codes of the system language;* and
- store the plurality of byte codes in a single file, wherein the byte codes are capable of being *executed by a Web server that implements the application programming interface of the system language.*

Claims 7, 18, and 21 have each been amended to incorporate similar features, in varying terms and scope. Support for the amendments can be found throughout Applicant's Specification. Particular attention, however, is drawn to the Specification, p. 3 lines 1-22; p. 4 lines 4-9; p. 5 lines 5-14; p. 13 line 23- p. 14 line 14. These examples describe using an application programming interface



of a high performance system language within the spirit of the amendments made in the independent claims. The references of record fail to disclose, teach, or suggest any such subject matter.

The references of record fail to disclose, teach, or suggest any such subject matter. Specifically, Britton and Andersen are both limited to traditional ASP techniques in which (1) the ASP is not pre-compiled (2) the user interfaces are generated directly from ASP code (2) there is no interaction with a high performance application programming interface of a system language. Accordingly, the proposed combination of references lacks all the features of the claims as presently recited. For example, Britton and Andersen do not provide a basis for a “compiled user interface template created using an Active Server Page Language which when compiled is executed through an application programming interface developed using a system language” and “executing the Active Server Page through the application programming interface to generate the requested Web page” as presently recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, claims 1, 7, 13, 18, 21, and 24 as presently recited and their respective dependent claims are allowable and the withdrawal of the §103 rejection is respectfully requested.



## **Conclusion**

The Application is in condition for allowance and the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/17/2008

By: /Daniel T. McGinnity, #55444/  
Daniel T. McGinnity  
Reg. No. 55444  
Attorney for Applicant

Sadler, Breen, Morasch & Colby, PS  
422 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 424  
Spokane, Washington 99201  
Telephone: (509) 755-7257  
Facsimile: (509) 755-7252

